

Panaji, 2nd February, 2017 (Magha 13, 1938)

SERIES II No. 44

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are six Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 43 dated 27-01-2017 as follows:—

- (1) Extraordinary dated 27-01-2017 from pages 989 to 992 regarding Orders from Department of Home.
- (2) Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 30-01-2017 from pages 993 to 996 regarding Orders from Department of Finance.
- (3) Extraordinary (No. 3) dated 30-01-2017 from pages 995 to 996 regarding Order & Notifications from Department of Elections & Department of Panchayats.
- (4) Extraordinary (No. 4) dated 31-01-2017 from pages 997 to 1000 regarding Notifications, Order & Corrigendum from Department of Elections, Finance & Home respectively.
- (5) Extraordinary (No. 5) dated 01-02-2017 from pages 1001 to 1002 regarding Direction, Notification & Orders from Department of Elections, General Administration and Home respectively.
- (6) Extraordinary (No. 6) dated 01-02-2017 from pages 1003 to 1010 regarding Order from Department of General Administration.

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Labour

Notification

No. 28/1/2016-LAB/Part-V/09

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II at Panaji-Goa on 14-10-2016 in reference No. LC-II/IT/1/16 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Georgina Saldanha, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2017.

IN THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar,
Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. LC-II/IT/1/16

Shri Urmila V. Mardolkar,
r/o. Parijat Church Colony,
Mangueshi,
Mardol-Goa

... Workman/Party I

V/s

M/s. Western India Service Centre,
105/30, Flat No. 3 and 4,
Gharge Residency,
Erandawana, Pune

... Employer/Party II

Party I/Workman represented by Adv. Shri S. Bhangu.

Party II/Employer marked as Ex-parte.

Panaji, Dated: 14-10-2016.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa by Order dated 04-01-2016 bearing No. 28/56/2015-Lab/6 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Labour Court II, Panaji-Goa.

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. Western India Service Centre, Near Sainath Hotel, Tisk, Ponda, Goa, in refusing employment to Smt. Urmila Vikas Mardolkar, Steno typist, with effect from September, 2014 is legal and justified?

(2) If not, what relief, the workperson is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT/01/16 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance

to the said notice, the Workperson/Party-I (for short, 'the Workperson') put in her appearance. The Employer/Party-II (for short "the Employer") was duly served by registered A/D notice. The Employer however, failed to appear on the scheduled date of hearing on and from 11-03-2016, either in person or through its duly authorized agent/representative, without any justifiable cause. Hence, the Employer was marked as Ex-parte.

3. The Workperson filed her Statement of Claim on 15-04-2016 at Exb. 4. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workperson are that the Employer is a partnership firm of Mr. Soumitra Wardekar and Smt. Manju A. Wardekar and engaged in sales/service/spares of cumin's spares division, Ponda-Goa. She stated that she was employed with the Employer as 'Steno-typist' since 14-01-1977. She stated that the Employer has failed to pay her salary since May, 2012. She stated that accordingly they had raised a dispute before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner, Ponda, Goa. She stated that the said dispute was resulted into a settlement u/s 12 (3) r/w Sec. 18 (3) of I.D. Act, 1947 between the management of the Employer and their workmen represented by Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh. She stated that as per the said terms of settlement, it was agreed between the parties that the wages of the workers will be paid up to October, 2013 in four equal installments and post dated cheques were issued to them. She stated that the said cheques issued by the Employer were dishonored. She stated that the Employer closed its office premises without any intimation to its employees since September, 2014, thereby refusing employment to all its employees. She stated that she therefore raised a dispute pertaining to refusal of her employment before Asstt. Labour Commissioner, Ponda, Goa, vide her representation dated 02-02-2015, which ended in failure.

4. She submitted that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to her without notice and wages in lieu of notices is in contravention of Section 25-F of the said Act and as such it is illegal, unjustified and malafide. She stated that after termination of her services she is unemployed. The Workperson therefore, prayed that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to her be declared as illegal and unjust and she be reinstated in service with full back wages, continuity in service and other consequential benefits.

5. Based on the pleadings filed by the Workperson, this Court framed the following issues on 24-06-2016 at Exb. 6.

1. Whether the Workperson/Party-I proves that she was working with the Employer/Party II as a Steno Typist since 14-01-1977 till the refusal of her employment w.e.f. September, 2014?
2. Whether the Workperson/Party-I proves that she was refused employment by the Employer w.e.f. September, 2014?
3. Whether the Workperson/Party-I proves that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to her w.e.f. September, 2014 is illegal and unjustified?
4. Whether the Workperson/Party-I is entitled to any relief?
5. What order? What award?
6. My answers to the aforesaid issues are as under:

Issue No. 1: In the affirmative.
 Issue No. 2: In the affirmative.
 Issue No. 3: In the affirmative.
 Issue No. 4& 5: As per final order.

REASONS

7. Issues Nos. 1 and 2:

Ld. Adv. Shri S. Bhangui, representing the Workperson chose to file his synopsis of written arguments on behalf of the Workperson. I have carefully perused the entire records of the present case including the synopsis of written arguments filed on behalf of Workperson. I have carefully considered the written submissions filed on behalf of the Workperson.

8. To prove her case, the Workperson has examined herself. The Workperson also produced on record certain documentary evidence in support of her oral evidence. The said oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by the Workperson on record remained unchallenged for want of denial.

9. The Workperson has produced on record her appointment letter dated 22-02-1977 (Exb. 8) issued by the Employer, appointing her as 'Steno-typist' as well as her letter of confirmation dated 11-07-1977, in support of her oral evidence. The Workperson has also produced on record a copy of memorandum of settlement dated 24-07-2013 (Exb.10) signed u/s 12 (3) r/w Rule 18 (3) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer suddenly closed its office premises in the month of September, 2014 without any intimation to its employees. The said oral as well as documentary evidence on record clearly

indicates that the Workperson was employed with the Employer continuously from 14-01-1977 till the refusal of her employment w.e.f. September, 2014. Hence, it is held that the Workperson succeeded in proving that she was employed with the Employer continuously from 14-01-1977 till the refusal of her employment w.e.f. September, 2014. The issue No. 1 and 2 is therefore answered in the affirmative.

10. Issue No. 3:

While deciding issue Nos. 1 and 2 herein above, I have come to the conclusion and held that the Workperson was employed with the Employer as Steno-typist continuously from 14-01-1977 till the date of refusal of her employment w.e.f. September, 2014.

11. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer closed its office premises without any intimation to its employees or without complying with the provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947 since September, 2014, thereby refusing employment to all the employees including the Workperson. As the said refusal of employment to the Workperson was permanent in nature, it amounts to termination of her services w.e.f. September, 2014. As the said termination of the Workperson w.e.f. September, 2014 is otherwise than punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, it amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

12. Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 lays down the pre-conditions for a valid retrenchment. Similarly, Section 25-G of the I.D. Act, 1947 laid down the procedure for valid retrenchment. The Workperson also challenged her termination of service w.e.f. September, 2014 by contending to be illegal and unjust as it is in violation of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is therefore necessary to go into the aforesaid relevant provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947.

25-F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen. – No Workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until-

- (a) the Workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the Workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;

- (b) the Workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and

- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette.

13. 25-G. Procedure for retrenchment:— Where any Workman in an industrial establishment, who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to a particular category of workmen in that establishment, in the absence of any agreement between the employer and the Workman in this behalf, the employee shall ordinarily retrench the Workman who was the last person to be employed in that category, unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman.

14. In the case in hand, the Workperson was in the employment of the Employer continuously from 14-01-1977 till September, 2014. The evidence on record indicates that though the services of the Workperson were retrenched w.e.f. September, 2014, neither she was issued one months' notice nor paid one months' pay in lieu of notice as well as retrenchment compensation equivalent to 15 days average pay of every completed years of continuous service at the time of retrenchment of her services. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer has also failed to prepare a seniority list in the category in which the Workperson was working at the time of retrenchment of her services as required under Rule 77 of the I.D. (Central) Rules, 1977. Thus, it is crystal clear that the retrenchment of the Workperson w.e.f. September, 2014 is in violation of Section 25-F as well as 25-G of the I.D. Act, 1947. Hence, it is held that the Workperson succeeded in proving that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to her w.e.f. September, 2014 is illegal and unjustified. The issue no.3 is therefore answered in the affirmative.

15. Issue No. 4:

While deciding the issue No. 3 hereinabove, I have come to the conclusion and held that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to her w.e.f. September, 2014 is illegal and unjustified.

16. The evidence on record indicates that the Workperson was in the employment of the Employer for more than 39 years. The evidence on record

indicates that age of the Workperson is more than 60 years. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer has closed its office premises since September, 2014. In the circumstances, the Workperson cannot be ordered to be reinstated in the service of the Employer. In my considered opinion, taking in to consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, awarding a lump sum monetary compensation of Rs.4,00,000/- (Rupees four lakhs only) to the Workperson would be an appropriate relief to meet the ends of justice.

In view of the above, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

1. It is hereby held that the action of the management of M/s. Western India Service Centre, Near Sainath Hotel, Tisk, Ponda, Goa, in refusing employment to Smt. Urmila Vikas Mardolkar, Steno typist, with effect from September, 2014, is illegal and unjustified.
2. The Employer M/s. Western India Service Centre, is hereby directed to pay to the Workperson Smt. Urmila Vikas Mardolkar, Steno typist, a sum of Rs. 4,00,000/- (Rupees four lakhs only).
3. No order as to cost.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Suresh N. Narulkar)
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court-II

Notification

No. 28/1/2016-LAB/Part-V/14

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II at Panaji-Goa on 14-10-2016 in reference No. LC-II/IT/2/16 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Georgina Saldanha, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2017.

IN THE LABOUR COURT-II
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar,
Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Case No. LC-II/IT/2/16

Shri Sayed Akbar,
H. No. 56, Veling,
Mardol-Goa

... Workman/Party I

V/s

M/s. Western India Service Centre,
105/30, Flat No. 3 and 4,
Gharge Residency,
Erandawana, Pune

... Employer/Party II

Party I/Workman represented by Adv. Shri S. Bhangui.

Party II/Employer marked as Ex-parte.

Panaji, Dated: 14-10-2016.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa, by Order dated 15-01-2016, bearing No. 28/57/2015-Lab/28, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Labour Court II, Panaji-Goa.

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s. Western India Service Centre, Near Sainath Hotel, Tisk, Ponda, Goa, in refusing employment to Shri Sayed Akbar, Sr. Accountant, with effect from September, 2014, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, what relief, the Workman is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. LC-II/IT/02/16 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance to the said notice, the Workman/Party-I (for short, 'the Workman') put in his appearance. The Employer/Party-II (for short "the Employer") was duly served by registered A/D notice. The Employer however, failed to appear on the scheduled date of hearing on and from 11-03-2016, either in person or through its duly authorized agent/representative, without any justifiable cause. Hence, the Employer was marked as Ex-parte and an ex-parte proceedings were conducted.

3. The Workman filed his Statement of Claim on 15-04-2016 at Exb. 4. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman are that the Employer is a partnership firm of Mr. Soumitra Wardekar and Smt. Manju A. Wardekar and engaged in sales/ /service/spares of cumin's spares division, Ponda-Goa. He stated that he was employed with the Employer as 'Sr. Accountant' since 01-08-1988. He stated that the Employer has failed to pay his salary since May, 2012. He stated that accordingly, they had raised a dispute before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner, Ponda, Goa. He stated that the said dispute was resulted into a settlement u/s 12 (3) r/w Sec. 18 (3) of I.D. Act, 1947 between the management of the Employer and their workmen represented by Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh. He stated that as per the said terms of settlement, it was agreed between the parties that the wages of the workers will be paid up to October, 2013 in four equal installments and post dated cheques were issued to them. He stated that the said cheques issued by the Employer were dishonored. He stated that the Employer closed its office premises, without any intimation to its employees, since September, 2014, thereby refusing employment to all its employees. He stated that he therefore raised a dispute pertaining to refusal of his employment before Asstt. Labour Commissioner, Ponda, Goa, vide his representation dated 02-02-2015, which ended in failure.

4. He submitted that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to him without notice and wages in lieu of notices is in contravention of Section 25-F of the said Act and as such it is illegal, unjustified and malafide. He stated that after termination of his services he is unemployed. The Workman therefore prayed that the action of the Employer in refusing him employment be declared as illegal and unjust and he be reinstated in service with full back wages, continuity in service and other consequential benefits.

5. Based on the pleadings filed by the Workman, this Court framed the following issues on 24-06-2016 at Exb. 5.

1. Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that he was working with the Employer/Party II as a 'Sr. Accountant' since 01-08-1988 till the refusal of his employment w.e.f. September, 2014?
2. Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that he was refused employment by the Employer w.e.f. September, 2014?

3. Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to his w.e.f. September, 2014 is illegal and unjustified?
4. Whether the Workman/Party-I is entitled to any relief?
5. What order? What award?
6. My answers to the aforesaid issues are as under:

Issue No. 1:	In the affirmative.
Issue No. 2:	In the affirmative.
Issue No. 3:	In the affirmative.
Issue No. 4 & 5:	As per final order.

REASONS

7. Issue Nos. 1 and 2:

Ld. Adv. Shri S. Bhangui, representing the Workman, chose to file his synopsis of written arguments on behalf of the Workman. I have carefully perused the entire records of the present case including the synopsis of written arguments filed on behalf of Workman. I have carefully considered the written submissions filed on behalf of the Workman.

8. To prove his case, the Workman has examined herself. The Workman also produced on record certain documentary evidence, in support of his oral evidence. The said oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by the Workman on record remained unchallenged for want of denial.

9. The Workman has produced on record his appointment letter dated 01-08-1988 (Exb.8) issued by the Employer, appointing him as 'Jr. Accountant' in support of his oral evidence. The Workman has also produced on record a copy of memorandum of settlement dated 24-07-2013 (Exb.09) signed u/s 12 (3) r/w Rule 18 (3) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer suddenly closed its office premises in the month of September, 2014 without any intimation to its employees. The said oral as well as documentary evidence on record clearly proves that the Workman was employed with the Employer continuously from 01-08-1988 till the refusal of his employment w.e.f. September, 2014. Hence, it is held that the Workman succeeded in proving that he was employed with the Employer continuously from 01-08-1988 till the refusal of his employment w.e.f. September, 2014. The issue No. 1 and 2 is therefore answered in the affirmative.

10. Issue No. 3:

While deciding issue No. 1 and 2 herein above, I have come to the conclusion and held that the Workman was employed with the Employer continuously from 01-08-1988 till the date of refusal of his employment w.e.f. September, 2014.

11. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer closed its office premises without any intimation to its employees or without complying with the provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947 since September, 2014, thereby refusing employment to all the employees including the Workman. As the said refusal of employment to the Workman was permanent in nature, it amounts to termination of his services w.e.f. September, 2014. As the said termination of the Workman w.e.f. September, 2014 is otherwise than punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, it amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

12. Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 lays down the pre-conditions for a valid retrenchment. Similarly, Section 25-G of the I.D. Act, 1947 laid down the procedure for valid retrenchment. The Workman also challenged his termination of service w.e.f. September, 2014 by contending to be illegal and unjust as it is in violation of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is therefore necessary to go into the aforesaid relevant provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947.

25-F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen.— No Workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until-

- (a) the Workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the Workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;
- (b) the Workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government (or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette.

13. 25-G. Procedure for retrenchment:— Where any Workman in an industrial establishment, who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to a particular category of workmen in that establishment, in the absence of any agreement between the employer and the Workman in this behalf, the employee shall ordinarily retrench the Workman who was the last person to be employed in that category, unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman.

14. In the case in hand, the Workman was in the employment of the Employer continuously from 01-08-1988 till September, 2014. The evidence on record indicates that though the services of the Workman were retrenched w.e.f. September, 2014, neither he was issued one months' notice nor paid one months' pay in lieu of notice as well as retrenchment compensation equivalent to 15 days average pay of every completed years of continuous service at the time of retrenchment of his services. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer has also failed to prepare a seniority list in the category in which the Workman was working at the time of retrenchment of his services as required under Rule 77 of the I.D. (Central) Rules, 1977. Thus, it is crystal clear that the retrenchment of the Workman w.e.f. September, 2014 is in violation of Section 25-F as well as 25-G of the I.D. Act, 1947. Hence, it is held that the Workman succeeded in proving that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to his w.e.f. September, 2014 is illegal and unjustified. The issue No.3 is therefore answered in the affirmative.

15. Issue No. 4:

While deciding the issue No. 3 hereinabove, I have come to the conclusion and held that the action of the Employer in refusing employment to him w.e.f. September, 2014 is illegal and unjustified.

16. The evidence on record indicates that the Workman was in the employment of the Employer for more than 28 years. The evidence on record indicates that age of the Workman is more than 55 years. The evidence on record indicates that the Employer has closed its office premises since September, 2014. In the circumstances, the Workman cannot be ordered to be reinstated in the service of the Employer. In my considered opinion, taking in to consideration the facts and

circumstances of the case, awarding a lump sum monetary compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees five lakhs only) to the Workman would be an appropriate relief to meet the ends of justice.

In view of the above, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

1. It is hereby held that the action the management of M/s. Western India Service Centre, Near Sainath Hotel, Tisk, Ponda, Goa, in refusing employment to Shri Sayed Akbar, Sr. Accountant with effect from September, 2014, is illegal and unjustified.
2. The Employer M/s. Western India Service Centre, is hereby directed to pay to the Workman Shri Sayed Akbar, Sr. Accountant, a sum of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rupees five lakhs only).
3. No order as to cost.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(Suresh N. Narulkar)
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court-II

Department of Personnel

Order

No. 22/2/2017-PER/232

The Governor of Goa is pleased to allocate the following subjects to the following IPS Officers with immediate effect, in public interest.

Sr. No.	Name of officer	Subject allocation
1	2	3
1.	Shri Vimal Anand Gupta, IPS (AGMUT: 2003) DIGP, North	He will supervise functioning of SP/North, SP/South, SP/ /Crime (FCL, Cyber Cell, FPB), SP/Security, SP/Coastal Security.
2.	Shri Bhairon Singh Gujar, IPS (AGMUT: 2003) DIGP, North	He will supervise functioning of SP (HQ), SP. Legal & Vigilance, PTS, Training, IRBn, Election Cell, Motor Transport, SP Home Guard & Civil Defence, SP/EOC.

1	2	3
3.	Shri Rupinder Kumar, IPS (AGMUT: 2003) Superintendent of Police	He will supervise functioning of SP/Traffic, Wireless & Communication, SP/SB, SPCR, he will also act as Head of SIT to investigate mining related cases. FB (FRRC), SP/ATS, SP/ANC.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Yetindra M. Maralkar, Addl. Secretary (Personnel).
Porvorim, 20th January, 2017.

Order

No. 22/2/2017-PER/233

In pursuance to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi, Order No. 14020/04/2016-UTS-I(Part-I) dated 30-12-2016, the Governor of Goa is pleased to appoint Shri Bhairon Singh Gujar, IPS (AGMUT:2003) as DIGP and Shri Rupinder Kumar, IPS (AGMUT:2003) as Superintendent of Police with immediate effect.

Shri Bhairon Singh Gujar, IPS (AGMUT:2003) and Shri Rupinder Kumar, IPS (AGMUT:2003) both have joined in this Administration on 07-01-2017 and were awaiting posting.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Yetindra M. Maralkar, Addl. Secretary (Personnel).
Porvorim, 20th January, 2017.

Order

No. 22/2/2017-PER/234

In pursuance to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi, Order No. 14020/04/2016-UTS-I(Part-I) dated 30-12-2016, the Governor of Goa is pleased to appoint Dr. Vivek Gogia IPS:1991 of AGMU Cadre as Inspector General of Police with immediate effect.

Dr. Vivek Gogia, IPS (AGMUT:1991) has reported for duty to this Administration on 11-01-2017 (a.n.) and was awaiting posting.

Dr. Vivek Gogia, IPS should draw his pay and allowance under the Budget Head against the post of Inspector General of Police.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Yetindra M. Maralkar, Addl. Secretary (Personnel).
Porvorim, 20th January, 2017.

Order

No. 5/4/2010-PER/238

Read: Order No. 6/4/91-PER (Part IV) dated 6-10-2016.

Shri Vinayak Volvoikar, Director of Provedoria shall draw his salary against the post of Leave & Training Reserve, South for the period from 06-10-2016 to 10-10-2016.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Meghana Shetgaonkar, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim, 23rd January, 2017.



Raj Bhavan

—

Order

No. GS/EST/PER/148/2016/262

Read: 1) Order No. GS/Estt/11/2016/2753 dated 23-11-2016.

- 2) Joining Report dated 16-12-2016 of Smt. Vanessa D'Cunha e D'Souza.
- 3) Option dated 30-12-2016 for pay fixation against the post of Section Officer on deputation.

The Hon'ble Governor of Goa is pleased to appoint Smt. Vanessa D'Cunha e D'Souza, Senior Assistant from the Secretariat cadre, against the post of Section Officer, Gazetted, Group 'B' in this office, in the pay scale of PB-2 Rs. 9,300-34,900+Grade Pay Rs. 4,600/- on deputation, initially for a period of one year with effect from 16th December, 2016 (b.n.).

The deputation of Smt. Vanessa D'Cunha e D'Souza shall be governed by the standard terms and conditions contained in the O. M. No. 13/4/74-PER dated 12-02-1999 issued by the Department of Personnel, Government of Goa and as amended from time to time.

The expenditure towards pay and allowances of Smt. Vanessa D'Cunha e D'Souza shall be debited to Budget Head "2012—Governor; 03—Governor/Administratio/U.Ts; 090—Secretariat; 01—Secretariat of the Governor (charged); 01—Salaries".

This issues in supersession of the earlier order read above.

Rupesh Kumar Thakur, IAS, Secretary to the Governor.

Dona Paula, 30th January, 2017.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 8.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA-327/350-2/2017.